

## REMARKS

Applicant wishes to thank the Examiner for speaking with Applicant's representative, Brian M. Duncan, on June 7, 2010. The Examiner stated that the case was in condition for allowance, however the Examiner requested that an amendment in response to the decision by the Board of Appeals be submitted by the Applicant to cancel withdrawn claims 12-24 and to address the objections to the drawings, abstract and claims as stated in the Office Action of April 17, 2008 (hereinafter "Office Action").

Claims 1, 3-6, 25 and 26 are in this application and are presented for consideration. By this amendment, Applicant has amended claims 3 and 4. Withdrawn claims 12-24 have been canceled.

The drawings have been objected to because the Office Action states that the drawings do not have sheet numbers placed in the middle of the top margin of the drawing sheets.

Applicant has attached replacement sheets of drawings of Figures 1, 2, 3, 4, 5A, 5B, 5C, 5D, 5E, 5F, 6, 7 and 8. Figures 1, 2, 3, 4, 5A, 5B, 5C, 5D, 5E, 5F, 6, 7 and 8 have been revised to include sheet numbers in the middle of the top margin of each figure. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner remove the objection to the drawings in light of the changes to Figures 1, 2, 3, 4, 5A, 5B, 5C, 5D, 5E, 5F, 6, 7 and 8.

The abstract has been objected to because the Office Action states that the abstract is replete with legal phraseology. The Office Action further states that the abstract in the marked up copy of the amended specification is not the same as the abstract provided in the clean copy.

Applicant has amended the abstract to remove the terms "means", "comprises" and

“characterized in that”. However, Applicant fails to understand the remark that the abstract in the marked up copy of the substitute specification of September 18, 2007 is not the same as the abstract provided in the clean copy of the substitute specification of September 18, 2007. Applicant has reviewed the marked-up substitute specification and the clean copy of the substitute specification and has found that the abstract of the marked-up copy of the substitute specification to be the same as the abstract of the clean copy of the substitute specification with the exception of the words being underlined in the abstract of the marked-up copy of the substitute specification. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner remove the objection to the abstract.

The disclosure has been objected to because of minor informalities.

Applicant has amended the specification as shown above to address this issue. Applicant wishes to thank the Examiner for the careful review of the claims. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner remove the objection to the disclosure.

Claims 3 and 4 have been objected to because of minor informalities.

Applicant has amended the claims paying close attention to the Examiner’s remarks. Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner remove the objection to the claims in view of the claims as now presented.

It is believed that the application as now presented is in condition for allowance. However, the Examiner is invited to contact one of Applicant’s representatives at the telephone number listed below should there be any outstanding issues remaining.

Favorable consideration on the merits is requested.

Respectfully submitted  
for Applicant,



By: \_\_\_\_\_  
John James McGlew  
Registration No. 31,903  
McGLEW AND TUTTLE, P.C.

- and -



By: \_\_\_\_\_  
Brian M. Duncan  
Registration No. 58,505  
McGLEW AND TUTTLE, P.C.

Attached: Eleven (11) Sheets of Replacement Drawings

JJM:BMD  
71665-17

DATED: June 8, 2010  
BOX 9227 SCARBOROUGH STATION  
SCARBOROUGH, NEW YORK 10510-9227  
(914) 941-5600

SHOULD ANY OTHER FEE BE REQUIRED, THE PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE  
IS HEREBY REQUESTED TO CHARGE SUCH FEE TO OUR DEPOSIT ACCOUNT 13-  
0410.